

# American Opinion Summary

## Department of State

Permanent file copy  
Do not remove

A-2-121

January 10, 1963

2. **Disarmament Conference: Soviet Reaction**

### 1. **ARMAMENT: THE SOVIET AND U.S. IN BUDAPEST**

The Soviet delegation to the talks here, a team composed largely of veterans of the 1959 Geneva Conference, "is not the negotiator of tomorrow. His departure immediately follows the feeling that he has become disengaged with the final stage of the proceedings," the U.S. *World Post*-dispatch comments. "Thus Mr. Dean is a man who is not easily disengaged."

The *World Post* sees in the withdrawal of "the only persistent and real sleep legislation that he has had" the belief in the "possibility of a breakthrough and that it will put into full swing the still dormant forces of legislation to help to nourish."

For the U.S. some doubtful but encouraging signs are being manifested in the Soviet delegation. "We are not sure there is little value in continuing the talks until the Russians change their policy," the New York Times claims. "Washington News says that if we are to go on "with the farce of trying to negotiate with the Communists, it is for us" Mr. Dean "couldn't care less" to stay."

The *Journal World* concludes that "the Soviets have obviously done much for a nuclear test ban in the last thirty months now or in the foreseeable future," and suggests that U.S. diplomatic mischance and inaction "go hand in hand with this fact perfectly clear to all the peoples of the world."

Above [tinyurl.com/2qzqzq](http://tinyurl.com/2qzqzq) there must be a "real surprise," according to the Washington Post. The Post interprets this as "a kind of tribute to Arthur W. Dean," because if he "could not make any progress in his position and unitizing efforts, there is not much likelihood that anyone else can." The Post goes on to suggest: "If we cannot have disarmament, perhaps we could make some progress toward some scientific and toward methods of minimizing the possibilities of nuclear war and accident."

### 2. **CUBA**

Initial reaction to the joint U.S.-Russian proposal to the UN of termination of their Cuban discussions focused on the "whole" expressed that actions taken to avert war over Cuba will ease tensions in other areas.

**Public Opinion Studies Staff • Bureau of Public Affairs**

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DOYLE  
(Continued)

The Washington Star feels the U.S.-Soviet deal "is not un-  
precedented." The assumption is that a similar Moscow will be  
united from Cuba in the period immediately ahead, says the  
Star; and despite failure to get on-site verification of  
missiles removed, Washington will maintain constant surveil-  
lance of Cuba, and Moscow "apparently is quite amenable" to  
this. The Star concludes that "on the whole, America seems  
to have come out of the crisis quite well."

But in view of the points of dispute that continue unresolved,  
said the Philadelphia Inquirer, "it should be clear to Khrush-  
chev and Castro that the U.S. is compelled to reserve the right  
to take whatever action may be required in the future--includ-  
ing, possibly, the invasion of Cuba--to counter any further  
aggressive threat."

Los Angeles Herald, reporting the breakdown  
of negotiations, also noted the lack of verification of "some  
statements that the withdrawal would be held on Cuba in which  
Russia's 'got nothers on em' attitude is contrary." David  
Lippman sees Russia left with "a hollow victory, and the  
U.S. with a defeat and a reversal" of the Monroe Doctrine.

Montreal's *Standard* and *Star* and *Advertiser* in particular  
expressed hope. "Everyone here right now hopes that the  
surprising decision of what one might be made" of the Soviet  
forces in Cuba came in for "productive and conclusive discussion"  
between the President and Russian minister Kuznetsov yesterday.

With others, Time warns that while the Russians have removed  
missiles and bombers, "they are apparently still pumping 'defense'  
arms" into Cuba (e.g., Marguerite Higgins, Newsweek). With  
"a company of undisclosed power hidden in Cuba," John S. Knight,  
asks: "Having been forced out, could it not happen again?"  
The Chicago Sun-Times complains of "a reluctance" lately of  
Washington's "get tough attitude" toward Castro.